

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 13, 14 and 16 – 24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 16 are independent.

In the present amendment, claims 1 – 3, 10, 11, 16 and 23 are amended substantially as suggested by the Examiner in the June 15, 2009 Office Action. The support for the claim amendments may be found in Applicants' specification, for example, Fig. 3. No new matter is added.

Claim 2 is objected to because of an informality. In the present amendment, claim 2 is amended to obviate this objection. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 2 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Office Action rejects claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 13, 14 and 16 – 24 over Masse et al. (US 6,990,570, hereinafter Masse), in view of Redford (US 6,732,253).

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 13, 14 and 16 – 24 are patentable over Masse and Redford, either singly or in combination.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

“a subset of the functional units are running repeat/loop instructions in a clock cycle.”

In the Office Action, page 5, the Office conceded that the combination of Masse and Redford only allows for all or none of the functional units to execute loop instructions at one point. Therefore, Masse and Redford fails to teach or suggest a subset of the functional units are running repeat/loop instructions in a clock cycle, as claimed.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Masse and Redford, either singly or in combination.

Independent claims 3, 10, 16 and 23, each in part, also requires:

“a subset of the functional units are running repeat/loop instructions in a clock cycle.”

Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 1 and apply them to claims 3, 10, 16 and 23, pointing out why Masse and Redford fail to disclose the above claimed feature. Therefore, claims 3, 10, 16 and 23 are patentable over Masse and Redford.

Claims 2, 5 – 9, 11, 13, 14, 17 – 22 and 24 respectively depend from claims 1, 16 and 23, and inherit all the respective features of claims 1, 16 and 23. Thus claims 2, 5 – 9, 11, 13, 14, 17 – 22 and 24 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 16 and 23, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11, 13, 14 and 16 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hay Yeung Cheung/
Hay Yeung Cheung
Registration No.: 56,666
Myers Wolin, LLC
(973) 401-7157

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001